

# Maine Learning Standards Review Panel Report

---

*Submitted by Judy Enright and Cathy McCue, Process Facilitators  
Nov. 11, 2014*

## Background

On September 15, 2014, Maine's Commissioner of Education Jim Rier announced the convening of The Maine Learning Standards Review Panel (Panel Participant List, Appendix A) to "assess the level of rigor and clarity of English Language Arts and Mathematics Standards" (Maine Department of Education Newsroom Announcement, Appendix B). This report documents the process and results of the panel's work.

## The Review Process: Day 1

Commissioner Rier addressed the panel at the outset of its work. He emphasized the rationale, importance, and focus of the work which was to "assess the level and rigor and clarity of English Language Arts and Mathematic Standards." He introduced the facilitators for the process, Judy Enright and Cathy McCue, independent consultants contracted to facilitate the work (Agenda Day 1, Appendix C). The panel then had an opportunity to work in small groups to provide initial feedback to the proposed work using a "Questions, Concerns, and Comments" template (Questions/Concerns, Appendix D). The Commissioner and his staff addressed the panel's questions and concerns and left the panel and the facilitators to their work (department assistance was available upon request by the panel each day of the process, and Commissioner Rier informally checked in with the group, in person, daily to reinforce the focus and importance of the work.)

The facilitators began their work by sharing draft review process documents including definitions, rubric, and, decision-making process. The panel reviewed and revised these documents (Review Process Documents, Appendices E, F, and G).

The math and ELA groups then divided into self-selected in grade level groups and began the actual review of the standards. At the end of the day, the whole group reconvened to give feedback on the efficiency of the process and the day as a whole (Participant Feedback, Appendix H). With few exceptions, the process was deemed efficient. At this point, the ELA and math groups planned to meet on separate days for the remainder of their standards review work.

## The Review Process: 9/23/14, 9/24/14, 9/30/14

On days 2 and 3 (Sept.23-24) of the review, found the ELA and math teams each met separately for one day (Agendas, Appendices I and J).

The K-5 and 9-12 ELA groups finished the review work by the end of September 23. The 6-8 ELA group finished the work the following week in a half-day session on September 30 (ELA Agenda, Appendix K). The math group finalized its work at the last meeting on October 24.

It is important to note that on the Sept. 23, 24, and 30 meeting days, the group read and discussed all feedback from the broader community posted on the Maine Department of Education website developed for that purpose.

<http://mainedoenews.net/share-your-suggestions-improving-maines-learning-standards-for-mathematics-and-english-language-arts/>

### **Results of Maine's Learning Standards Review**

The actual review results were documented standard by standard on the review rubric (ELA and Math Standards Review Results, Appendices L).

The math group found 456 out of 465 of Maine Learning Results Math Standards to be clear and rigorous. They found that aspects of the following components needed further attention:

- K-2 Geometry and Measurement and Data
- 3-5 Measurement and Data, Number Operations Fractions
- 6-8 The Number System, Geometry
- High School Geometry and Statistics and Probability

While the ELA group found 689 out of 695 Maine Learning Results ELA Standards to be clear and rigorous, they found that aspects of the following components needed further attention:

- K-5 Foundational Skills: Print Concepts, Range of Writing
- 6-8 Informational Reading: Key Ideas and Details, Production and Distribution of Writing
- 9-12 Reading Literature Integration of Knowledge and Skills

### **The Final Meeting of the Review Panel**

In preparation for the final Panel meeting on October 24, the panel members gave suggestions to the facilitators for the final meeting (Meeting Agenda Input, Appendix M) at their last ELA and math grade-level meetings. The agenda for the final meeting was designed with that feedback in mind (Final Meeting Agenda, Appendix N).

On October 24, the ELA and math groups had an opportunity to review the work and give input for this report. The Maine Department of Education team also met with the panel to review the panel's standard revisions, observations, notations, and suggestions and explain the final steps of the review process.

### **The Review Panel's Final Feedback on the Standards Review Process**

At the end of the final panel meeting on October 24, the panel members gave written feedback on the review process as a whole (Participant Feedback, Appendix O). The majority of the panel members completing the survey rated the process as effective and well facilitated. The majority of members also felt that their voices were heard in the review process, that the panel accomplished its task, and that this report accurately reflected their work.

## Appendices

---

Appendix A: Review Panel Participants .....	5
Appendix B: Maine Department of Education Newsroom Announcement 9/15/14 .....	6
Appendix C: Standards Review Agenda Day 1 .....	8
Appendix D: Initial Participant Questions/Concerns Day 1 .....	9
Appendix E: Revised Definitions for Standards Review Process .....	11
Appendix F: Revised Rubric for Standards Review .....	12
Appendix G: Revised Consensus Process for Standards Review .....	13
Appendix H: End of Day 1 Participant Feedback 9/16/14 .....	14
Appendix I: ELA Agenda 9/23/14 .....	15
Appendix J: Math Agenda 9/24/14 .....	16
Appendix K: ELA Agenda 9/30/14 .....	17
Appendix L: ELA Standards Suggestions for Revision .....	18
Appendix M: Participant Input for Final Meeting .....	32
Appendix N: Agenda for Final Meeting .....	34
Appendix O: Participant Feedback on the Review Process .....	36

## Appendix A: Review Panel Participants

<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Subgroup</b>
Kim Buckheit	Principal	Troy Howard Middle School	ELA
Becky Fles	School Board Member	MSAD 11	ELA
Heidi Goodwin	Literacy Coach	MSAD 54	ELA
Sherri Gould	English Teacher	Nokomis Regional HS/RSU # 19	ELA
Paul Hambleton	Deputy Executive Director	Maine Education Association	ELA
David Lentini	Community Member	No Common Core Maine	ELA
Heather Manchester	Curriculum Director	MSAD # 17	ELA
Joyce McPhetres	Chief Human Resources Officer	Maine Community Health Options	ELA
Mary Nash	Superintendent	MSAD/RSU 35	ELA
Cathryn A. Wimet	Associate Professor, Literacy Education	Univ. of Maine at Farmington	ELA
Robb Warren	School Leader	Vinalhaven School	ELA
Carolyn Arline	Math Teacher	Richmond HS/RSU # 2	Math
Sandra Cookson	Curriculum Coordinator	RSU 87	Math
Peter Geiger	Chair	State Board of Education	ELA
Sally Loughlin	Curriculum Coordinator	RSU 51/MSAD 51	Math
Ginny Mott	President	Maine PTA	Math
Jen Robitaille	Title 1A Math Teacher	Lisbon Community School	Math
Laura Reynolds	Teacher	Lawrence Jr. High School/MSAD # 49	Math
Heidi Sampson	Member	State Board of Education	Math
Marlene Tallent	President-Elect	Maine School Boards Association	Math
Chris Howell	Principal	Windham High School	Math
Kelly McCormick	Professor	USM	Math
Pender Makin	Director	The Real School	Math

## Appendix B: Maine Department of Education Newsroom Announcement 9/15/14

### Panel convened by Education Commissioner to improve Maine learning results, public input sought

Posted on [September 15, 2014](#) by [Samantha Warren](#)

*Recommendations will inform improvements the Maine Department of Education intends for the state's math and English language arts standards*

AUGUSTA – Maine's Education Commissioner is asking the public and a panel of parents, educators and business leaders to inform improvements his Department plans to make to the state's learning standards for mathematics and English language arts.

Maine Department of Education Commissioner Jim Rier announced today that [a 24-member panel](#) will begin work this week to assess the rigor and clarity of the standards.

Learning standards set what students should know and be able to do at each grade level.

In Maine, standards in eight content areas make up the Maine Learning Results, adopted in 1997. While the standards are established for all public schools by the Maine DOE with approval by the Legislature and the Governor, how educators support students in achieving them is a local decision.

Since 1997, there have been four updates to the Maine Learning Results, most recently in 2011 to the standards for math and English language arts.

Commissioner Rier hopes [the Department's review](#) will focus attention on the specific standards and how to improve them, drawing on the experience of their implementation in Maine's classrooms over the past three years.

"All Mainers want high standards for our students and know they are capable of meeting them," Rier explained. "There is now greater awareness about our standards than ever before. This transparent review and eventual rulemaking process provides an opportunity to leverage that interest and bring Maine people together to ensure our state's standards are the best they can be at preparing all of our students for college and career success."

The panel will be comprised of parents, teachers, principals, superintendents, school board members, college professors and business leaders. Its work is public and members of the public are also invited to [submit input](#) to improve specific standards through an online comment form on the Maine DOE's website.

The Maine Learning Standards Review Panel will hold its first meeting on Tuesday, Sept. 16 from 9 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. That meeting will largely focus on defining the review process.

Content-specific subgroups will then each hold four subsequent weekly meetings before a meeting of the full panel on Oct. 24. to finalize their recommendations. All meetings will be held at the Cross Office Building at 111 Sewall St. in Augusta.

The Commissioner will consider the input of the panel and public and plans to initiate a formal rulemaking process that would additionally allow for public comment. The changes would also require public hearings before the Department and the Legislature, which would have final approval authority.

Maine students would still be assessed on the current standards this spring for State and federal school accountability.

To submit public input or for more information about the Maine Learning Standards Review Panel including its members, meeting schedule and the standards it will review, visit [www.maine.gov/doe/standardsreview](http://www.maine.gov/doe/standardsreview).

## Appendix C: Standards Review Agenda Day 1

### **Maine Learning Standards Review**

*Cross State Office Building – Room 103 A & B*

*Sept. 16, 2014*

8:30 Coffee

9:00 Session Starts

2:30 Session Ends

### **Agenda**

*Judy Enright and Cathy McCue, Facilitators*

Welcome and Introductions

Rationale, Outcomes and Other Considerations

Info. Processing in Small Groups

Getting Ready for the Review Process

- Move Into ELA and Math Teams
- Connecting
- Review Process Logistics
- Definitions
- Rating Rubric
- Decision-making Process
- Pacing
- The Parking Lot
- Team Roles
- Best Working Conditions
  - The Review Process Test Drive
  - Feedback and Adjustment
  - Next Steps/Next Meeting/Closure



## **Appendix D: Initial Participant Questions/Concerns Day 1**

### **Maine Standards Review: Initial Participant Input Day 1**

*Sept. 16, 2014*

#### **Questions:**

What will we exactly be looking at?  
Why? Has this work already been done?  
Tight timeline = lots to do, little time  
Impact on H.S work already done?  
What is ultimate goal = product?  
How extensive does this review need to be?  
Why this review now?  
What is the end result are striving for?  
Which standards/at which level?  
Is the CCSS copyrighted? If so, why is that?  
What are the ramifications of changing the standards?  
Will we examine developmental inappropriateness?

#### **Concerns:**

Is this work too late?  
Impact on work already done by Maine educators  
Connections to SBAC  
Hope to depoliticize standards  
Understanding of the big ideas of creativity, critical thinking, innovation.  
How do we help teachers move to implementation of standards?  
Public perceptions – curriculum vs. standards  
Ed. Reg. 132. Final outcome of our ed. system are the guiding principles. Standards are a means by which our students will attain guiding principles.  
How do we ensure that all stakeholders understand the standards and the work embedded in them?  
How do we support teachers as they move into CCSS? (time resources, training)  
How do we build capacity with CCSS with the demands of other initiatives?  
How do we maintain momentum with all these initiatives?  
Are we moving the target, changing the standards, or refining the standards?

#### **Comments:**

Focus on best interest of students in Maine  
How does how we define terms impact local control?

This has been a process that has been open and inclusive

NBCT standards are similar, also NCTM

ELA is infinitely improved over No Child Left Behind

The standards can ensure that students (no matter where they live) know and are able to do common competencies; it provides equity for learners and their employers.

## Appendix E: Revised Definitions for Standards Review Process

### DEFINITIONS

**CLARITY:** Quality of being easily understood. (*Merriamwebster.com*)

- These standards can be used by educators to clearly guide learning for students.
- An educator can use these standards to easily communicate what the learning targets are to students and parents.

**RIGOR and COLLEGE-CAREER READINESS:** In education, rigor is commonly applied to lessons [standards] that encourage students to question their assumptions and think deeply, rather than lessons [standards] that merely demand memorization and information recall.

(*Edglossary.org created by Great Schools Partnership*)

- There are two aspects of rigor to keep in mind, depth/breadth of content and complexity of reasoning.
- These standards should be rigorous in content and/or in complexity of reasoning to be rated rigorous.

## Appendix F: Revised Rubric for Standards Review

	0	1	Rating	Notes
<b>Clarity</b>	Does NOT guide learning for students and/or support educator communication of the standard to students and parents	Guides learning for students and/or supports educator communication of the standard to students and parents		
<b>Rigor/ College and Career Ready</b>	Does NOT support complexity of reasoning, breadth/depth of content or college and/or career readiness	Supports complexity of reasoning, breadth/depth of content or college and/or career readiness		

## Appendix G: Revised Consensus Process for Standards Review

### The Decision-Making Process

- Thumb up - I agree with rating
- Thumb sideways - I can live with the rating and will support the rating
- Thumb down - I need to talk more about this standard in order to reach consensus

#### Process:

1. The facilitator will call for the “thumbs” rating of each standard.

2. All “thumbs up, or all sideways, or all down” and the rating is complete.

If the consensus rating is “thumbs down,” then the team scribe makes a note on the rating rubric suggesting how to revise the standard.

3. Any “thumbs down” will trigger a discussion of the reasoning around the rating.

This increases the possibility for greater clarity and ultimately for reaching consensus.

If the person(s) with the “thumbs down” rating:

- Acknowledges that he/she has been heard and understands the reasoning around the rating by the rest of the group, and moves to a thumb sideways or a thumbs up rating as a result, then consensus is reached.
- Continues to be “thumbs down” but feels heard and understood, then he/she may choose to “gift” their support for the rating to the group, thus enabling the decision to move forward to consensus.
- Remains unconvinced and “thumbs down” regarding the decision on the table, then the decision moves forward with note taken of his/her differing opinion on the rating rubric. (Note: at this point the consensus decision-making process is not in play and it becomes a majority decision.)

## Appendix H: End of Day 1 Participant Feedback 9/16/14

### **Chart Paper Feedback (end of day) from Meeting #1 Maine Standards Review Panel**

*Sept. 16, 2014*

*At the end of the first meeting, participants gave feedback on the review process and then discussed it. The goal was to fine-tune the process moving forward.*

#### **What's Working?**

- Decision-making process
- Dialog
- Facilities, room, material, etc.
- Group dynamics
- Process
- Food
- 6-8 ELA: Our group is AWESOME!

#### **What's Not?**

- Are we addressing developmental appropriateness...its about more than rigor
- Network (in-room Wi-Fi)
- Group space/noise
- Saturation

#### **Questions?**

- Is the workday the same each time? ...fatigue
- Can we be flexible with our group to meet personal travel needs?

#### **Wishes and Suggestions?**

- Do they (DOE) really want our suggestions?
- For Math People, when we meet next time we'll want to organize ourselves into 2 groups – issue: reading and talking
- We would like to be given/make a schedule each day.
- Link conversations among grade level groups.

## **Appendix I: ELA Agenda 9/23/14**

### **Maine Learning Standards Review**

*Cross State Office Building – Room 103 A & B*

*Sept. 23, 2014*

*9:00-2:30*

### **ELA Agenda**

*Judy Enright and Cathy McCue, Facilitators*

- Reconnecting and Orienting New Folks
- Agenda Overview
- Review of Web Input
- Feedback From Last Time
- Doin' THE WORK
- Brain Break
- Doin' THE WORK
- Whole Group Update/Progress Sharing
- Working Lunch Options
- Continuing the Work
- Brain Break
- Final “Work” for the Day
- Feedback and Adjustment
- Whole Group Update/ Progress Sharing
- Next Steps/Next Meeting
- Closure

## **Appendix J: Math Agenda 9/24/14**

### **Maine Learning Standards Review**

*Cross State Office Building – Room 500*

*Sept. 24, 2014*

*9:00-2:30*

### **Math Review Agenda**

*Judy Enright and Cathy McCue, Facilitators*

- Reconnecting and Orienting New Folks
- Agenda Overview
- Review of Web Input
- Doin' THE WORK
- Brain Break
- Doin' THE WORK
- Working Lunch Options
- Continuing the Work
- Brain Break
- Final “Work” for the Day
- Whole Group Update/ Progress Sharing
- Next Steps/Next Meeting/Closure



## **Appendix K: ELA Agenda 9/30/14**

### **Maine Learning Standards Review**

*Cross State Office Building – Room 600*

*Sept. 30, 2014*

*9:00-2:30*

### **ELA Agenda**

*Judy Enright and Cathy McCue, Facilitators*

- Reconnecting
- Review of Web Input
- Work Time
- Working Lunch Options
- Work Time
- Feedback and Adjustment
- Next Meeting
- Closure

## Appendix L: ELA Standards Suggestions for Revision

### ELA Standards

Grade Level	Standards	Clarity score	Rigor/ etc. score	Comments from panelists related to clarity or rigor or both
K-5	ELA: Language: Conventions of Standard English	1	1	(Rigor/College & Career Ready) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transition 5-6 is fine.</li> </ul>
K-5	ELA: Foundational Skills: Fluency	1	1	(Rigor/College & Career Ready) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Note: To 6<sup>th</sup> grade teachers – check out 5<sup>th</sup> grade fluency!</li> </ul>
K-5	ELA: Foundational Skills: Phonics & Word Recognition	1	1	(Rigor/College & Career Ready) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grade 4 &amp; 5: note to teachers – use more complex/ sophisticated vocabulary to delineate between the grades.</li> <li>(ramp up vision between 4/5)</li> </ul>
K-5	ELA: Foundational Skills: Phonological Awareness	1	1	
K-5	ELA: Foundational Skills: Print Concepts	1	0	(Rigor/College & Career Ready) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grade 1 indicator for print concepts would be better placed in kindergarten.</li> </ul>
K-5	ELA: Informational Text: Craft & Structure	1	1	(Rigor/College & Career Ready) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clear/appropriate transition from 5<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> grade</li> </ul>
K-5	ELA: Informational Text: Integration of Knowledge & Ideas	1	1	(Rigor/College & Career Ready) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clear/appropriate transition from 5<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> grade</li> </ul>
K-5	ELA: Informational Text: Key Ideas & Details	1	1	(Rigor/College & Career Ready) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clear/appropriate transition from 5<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> grade</li> </ul>
K-5	ELA: Informational Text: Range of Reading & Level of Complexity (ref. pp. 31-33)	1	1	(Rigor/College & Career Ready) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clear transition between 5<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> grade</li> </ul>
K-5	ELA: Language: Knowledge of Language	1	1	(Clarity) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Examples are very helpful.</li> </ul> (Rigor/College & Career Ready) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transition 5-6 is fine.</li> </ul>
K-5	ELA: Literature: Craft and Structure	1	1	(Clarity) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RL 2.6 (e.g. including by speaking.....)</li> <li>RL 4.4 Is Mythology a required genre?</li> </ul>
K-5	ELA: Literature: Integration of Knowledge & Ideas	1	1	(Rigor/College & Career Ready) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clear/appropriate transition from 5<sup>th</sup> to 6<sup>th</sup> grade</li> </ul>

K - 5	ELA: Literature: Key Ideas and Details	1	1	(Rigor/College & Career Ready) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transition from 5-6 (opinion or argument) is abrupt.</li> <li>Consider adding argument to 5<sup>th</sup> grade.</li> <li>Reference the amount of each type of writing that is expected (% in each) as noted in the appendices.</li> </ul>
K-5	ELA: Literature: Range of Reading & Text Complexity (ref. pp. 31-33)	1	1	(Rigor/College & Career Ready) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appropriate/clear transition from 5<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> grade standards</li> </ul>
K-5	ELA: Speaking & Listening: Comprehension & Collaboration	1	1	(Rigor/College & Career Ready) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Note – this is where teachers have an opportunity to teach social skills through group discussion/interaction.</li> </ul>
K-5	ELA: Speaking & Listening: Presentation of Knowledge & Ideas	1	1	(Rigor/College & Career Ready) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requires technology</li> <li>Potential equity issues (#5)</li> </ul>
K-5	ELA: Language: Vocabulary Acquisition & use	1	1	(Rigor/College & Career Ready) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transition 5-6 is fine.</li> </ul>
K-5	ELA: Writing: Production & Distribution of Writing	1	1	(Rigor/College & Career Ready) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the assessment (SBAC) is going to require 3<sup>rd</sup> graders to be proficient in keyboarding, then keyboarding needs to be introduced earlier than third grade.</li> </ul>
K-5	ELA: Writing: Range of Writing	1	0	(Rigor/College & Career Ready) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should start in kindergarten! (contradicts the standards for T, T &amp; P)</li> <li>Transition for 5<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> is good.</li> </ul>
K-5	ELA: Writing: Research to Build & Present Knowledge	1	1	(Clarity) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“New approach” needs to be clarified. What does that mean?</li> </ul> <div style="text-align: right;">5<sup>th</sup> grade 6<sup>th</sup> grade # 5</div> (Rigor/College & Career Ready) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transition 5-6<sup>th</sup> is fine.</li> </ul>
K-5	ELA: Writing: Text Types & Purposes	1	1	

6-8	ELA: Informational Text: Craft & Structure	1	.5	<p>(Rigor/College &amp; Career Ready)</p> <p>Standard # 5, grade 8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We think “structure of a specific paragraph” should be expanded to “... paragraph, chapter, section.” In other words, bridge grade 7-9 better.</li> </ul>
6-8	ELA: Informational Text: Integration of Knowledge and Ideas	1	1 (.75)	<p>(Rigor/College &amp; Career Ready)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Standard 8, grade 8 is not a rigorous bridge between standard 8 in grades 7 and 9. We propose, after semicolon: “... identify the irrelevant evidence introduced and the author’s purpose for introducing it.”</li> <li>Standards 7 &amp; 9 are fine.</li> </ul>
6-8	ELA: Informational Text: Key Ideas & Details	0	0	<p>(Clarity)</p> <p>We question the clarity, as it impacts rigor, of standard # 2 as it develops from grade 7 through 12. Specifically, the focus seems to shift from two or more central ideas in grade 6-7, to one (a) central idea in grade 8, to two or more central ideas in grade 9 and beyond. Did the authors intend that the grade 8 standard starts with “Determine <u>the</u> – rather than <u>a</u> – central idea?”</p> <p>(Rigor/College &amp; Career Ready)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We think # 1 is clear and rigorous, ditto for # 3.</li> </ul>
6-8	ELA: Informational Text: Range of Reading & Level of Complexity (see pp. 31-33)	1	1	<p>(Rigor/College &amp; Career Ready)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Because the focus is on the 6-8 band of text complexity, is the 8<sup>th</sup> grade standard as rigorous as it could be if the text band was expanded upward for 8<sup>th</sup> grade?</li> </ul>

6-8	ELA: Literature: Key Ideas & Details	1	1	<p>(Clarity)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• #2 (after semicolon): why is the grade 6 phrasing different from grade 7 &amp; 8? Should gr. 6 be about <u>recognizing</u> difference between objective summaries and personal opinions?</li> <li>• Where is Louise Rosenblatt in all this? Should the abilities to connect/personalize and be objective both be developed throughout the 6-8 span?</li> <li>• “Determine” implies a judgment to us. We prefer “identify.”</li> <li>• Maine should develop its own list of illustrative texts and regularly update it. The range of written material/text should be broad.</li> </ul>
6-8	ELA: Literature: Craft and Structure	1	1	<p>(Clarity)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• #5, grade 7 – remove examples in parentheses; they are restrictive, rather than expansive.</li> </ul>
6-8	ELA: Literature: Integration of Knowledge & Ideas	1	1	
6-8	ELA: Literature: Range of Reading & Text Complexity	1	1	<p>(Rigor/College &amp; Career Ready)</p> <p>Because the focus is on the 6-8 band of text complexity, are the 8<sup>th</sup> grade standards as rigorous as it could be if the text band was expanded upwards for 8<sup>th</sup> grade?</p>

6-8	ELA: Writing: Production & Distribution of Writing	1  0	1  0	<p>(Clarity)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For standards # 4 &amp; # 5</li> <li>For standard # 6. The language seems to be dated, fuzzy and unclear. Exactly, what should a student be able to do?</li> </ul> <p>(Rigor/College &amp; Career Ready)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For # 4 &amp; # 5, connection to standards # 1-3 should be considered.</li> <li>Because # 6 is unclear and outdated, we cannot figure out if the flow from 6-8 is rigorous.</li> </ul>
6-8	ELA: Writing: Range of Writing	1	1	
6-8	ELA: Writing: Research to Build & Present Knowledge	1	1	
6-8	ELA: Writing: Text Types & Purposes	1	1	<p>(Rigor/College &amp; Career Ready)</p> <p>We are concerned with the development of rigor in the 4-8 span, with dense rigor development in 4-6 but minimal development in grades 7 &amp; 8. Should rigor be more evenly distributed?</p>
9-12	ELA: Language: Conventions of Standard English	1	1	<p>(Rigor/College &amp; Career Ready) (p. 54)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>While the ability to demonstrate command or conventions is not necessarily a rigorous task, the knowledge required to actually demonstrate it is rigorous.</li> <li>Note: This standard indicator could be a minefield to navigate with teachers who may read and apply it literally as a call-back to Warriner days.</li> </ul>
9-12	ELA: Language: Knowledge of Language	1	1	(p. 54)
9-12	ELA: Language: Vocabulary Acquisition of Use	1	1	
9-12	ELA: Literature: Craft & Structure	1	1	<p>(Rigor/College &amp; Career Ready) (p. 38)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Love how the aesthetics of language is addressed in craft &amp; structure 4</li> </ul>

9-12	ELA: Literature: Key Ideas & Details	1	1	<p>(Clarity) (Pg. 38)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The indicators for both grade spans are clear for all stakeholders. Would recommend a glossary to define terms such as “analyze” and “summarize.”</li> </ul> <p>(Rigor/College &amp; Career Ready)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The indicators are rigorous in terms of the thinking required (analyze, infer, summarize, synthesize) and the content.</li> </ul>
9-12	ELA: Literature: Integration of Knowledge & Ideas	1	0	<p>(Rigor/College &amp; Career Ready) (pg. 38)</p> <p><b>Analyze</b></p> <p><b>Demonstrate</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should # 9 be switched from grade spans? Which is higher level?</li> <li>Should # 9 in the 11-12 span be more inclusive and more beyond “demonstrate”?</li> <li>Seems to be a simple comparison/contrast for # 9 in the 11-12 span.</li> </ul>
9-12	ELA: Literature: Range of Reading & Text Complexity (reference pp. 57-58)	1	1	(pg. 38)
9-12	ELA: Informational Text: Key Ideas & Details	1	1	(pg. 40)
9-12	ELA: Informational Text: Craft & Structure	1	1	

9-12	ELA: Informational Text: Integration of Knowledge & Ideas	1	1	(Rigor/College & Career Ready) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggest changing “including” to “e.g.” # 9 in gr. Span 11-12.</li> <li>Suggest “pre-20<sup>th</sup> century” to replace “seventeenth-eighteenth-, and nineteenth century.”</li> <li>Should the content be widened to include global foundational documents rather than just us?</li> <li>We need to ensure global citizenry.</li> <li>Eliminate US in 9-10 band and in 11-12, band for # 9.</li> </ul>
9-12	ELA: Informational Text: Range of Reading & Level of Complexity (reference pp. 57-58)	1	1	
9-12	ELA: Speaking & Listening: Comprehension & Collaboration	1	1	p. 50
9-12	ELA: Speaking & Listening: Presentation of Knowledge & Ideas	1	1	p. 50
9-12	Writing: History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects: Production & Distribution of Writing	1	1	
9-12	Writing: History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects: Range of Writing	1	1	p. 66
9-12	Writing: History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects: Research to Build & Present Knowledge	1	1	
9-12	ELA: Writing History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects: Text Types & Purposes	1	1	p. 64 *Note: We wonder why the skill of “establishing and maintaining a formal style ...” is not carried into the 11-12 grade span.
9-12	ELA: Writing: Production & Distribution of Writing	1	1	p. 46
9-12	ELA: Writing: Range of Writing	1	1	p. 47
9-12	ELA: Writing: Research to Build & Present Knowledge	1	1	(pg. 46-47)



9-12	ELA: Writing: Text Types & Purposes	1	0	(Rigor/College & Career Ready) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 for 11-12 students: Id.2e = delete formal; replace with</li> <li>“appropriate &amp; effective ...”</li> <li>2 – delete objective</li> <li>3.C – Build upon this language for 1d &amp; 2e</li> <li>Formal style &amp; obj. tone is limiting and <u>“schoolish”</u></li> </ul>
9-12	Reading: Science & Technical Subjects: Craft and Structure	1	1	(Pg. 62)
9-12	Reading: Science & Technical Subjects: Integration of Knowledge & Ideas	1	1	(Pg. 62)
9-12	Reading: Science & Technical Subjects: Key Ideas & Details	.75	1	(Clarity) (Pg. 62) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li># 3: Will a science teacher be able to know what is meant by “attending to special cases or exceptions defined in the text?”</li> <li>If so, we’re good to go!</li> </ul>
9-12	Reading: Science & Technical Subjects: Range of Reading and Level of Text Complexity	1	1	
9-12	Reading: Social Studies/History: Craft and Structure	1	1	
9-12	Reading: Social Studies/History: Integration of Knowledge & Ideas	1	1	
9-12	Reading: Social Studies/History: Key Ideas & Details	1	1	(Pg. 62)
9-12	Reading: Social Studies/History: Range of Reading and Level of Text Complexity	1	1	*Important to note that the texts are recommended titles not mandated titles in the text complexity band. (“of similar merit”).

### Rating Guide:

#### Clarity

**0** = Does not guide learning for students and/or support educator communication of the standard to parents

**1** = Guides learning for students and/or supports educator communication of the standard to parents

#### Rigor/College & Career Ready

**0** = Does not support complex reasoning, depth/breadth of complex content, and/or college and career readiness

**1** = Supports complex reasoning, depth/breadth of complex content, and/or college and career readiness

## Math Standards

**\*Note: Bold text in the “Notes” section means if revised would make it a “1”**

Grade Level	Standards	Clarity	Rigor/etc.	Notes
K	Counting & Cardinality	1	1	
K-2	Geometry	<b>0</b> <del>4</del>	1	(Clarity) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>K.G.3. Take out “(“solid”).</b></li> </ul> (Rigor/College & Career Ready) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A panelist wants more emphasis on professional development related to understanding fractions (see 1.G.3. &amp; 2.G.3.).</li> </ul>
K-2	Measurement & Data	<b>0</b> <del>4</del>	<b>0</b> <del>4</del>	??? → We noticed the calendar (e.g. days of week, months) is not included; would it be appropriate to include this here. (Clarity) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>2.MD.5. Take out “such as drawings of rulers.”</b></li> <li><b>2. MD.2. Change it to “Measure the length of an object twice, using 2 units; describe how the measurements relate to the size of the unit chosen.”</b></li> <li><b>2. MD.7. Add “including noon &amp; midnight.”</b></li> </ul>
K-2	Operations & Algebraic Thinking	1	1	(Rigor/College & Career Ready) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A panelist questions the developmental appropriateness of <b>1.OA.8.</b></li> </ul>
K-2	Number Operations in Base Ten	1	1	
3-5	Geometry	1	1	(Clarity) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5.G.4. Include an example</li> </ul>
3-5	Measurement & Data	<b>0</b> <del>4</del>	1	(Clarity) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>4.MD.3. Include the formulas for area and perimeter of rectangles.</b></li> <li><b>5.MD.5b. Change it to big B. <math>V=b \times h</math> <del><math>V=B \times h</math></del></b></li> </ul>
3-5	Number Operations in Base Ten	1	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A panelist wonders if there should be a specific standard about multiplication &amp; division using zero.</li> </ul>
3-5	Number Operations Fractions	<b>0</b> <del>4</del>	1	A panelist wonders how you assess “understanding.” Should “understanding” be replaced by “know” or “demonstrate.” (Clarity) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>5.NO.5.5. Define the term “scaling” in the glossary.</b></li> </ul>
3-5	Operations & Algebraic Thinking	1	1	(Clarity) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3.OA.3. Include “symbol or letter.”</li> </ul>

6-7	Ratio & Proportional Relations	1	1	(Clarity) <i>See notes to clarify</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 - “tape diagram” not familiar term</li> <li>• 3.d. clarify? Convert to appropriate units.</li> </ul>
6-8	The Number System	1	0 4	(Clarity) We did not find the following to be compellingly clear: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pg. 42 6.NS # 3</li> <li>• Pg. 43 # 5</li> <li>• Pg. 43 # 6 Part C – Part 2</li> </ul> 6NS3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What does it mean “the” standard algorithm?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Fluently add, subtract, multiply, and divide multi-digit decimals using a standard or an accurate algorithm for each operation.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 6.NS.5. Remove “together” – understand that positive and negative numbers are used to describe.</li> <li>• 6.NS.6C. Re-word. Find and position points (using integers and other rational #'s)</li> <li>• on a coordinate plane.</li> </ul>
6-8	Expressions & Equations	1	1	(Clarity)  6.EE.2A. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Instead of “stand for,” should use “representing” (consistent use)</li> </ul> 7.EE.4A. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Compare an “algebraic solution” – means an algebraic <u>equation</u>?</li> </ul>

6-8	Geometry	1	0 +	(Clarity) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6.G.1. “special” quadrilateral             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>List which ones</li> <li>What is special – list special ones for this grade level</li> </ul> </li> <li>6.G.2. correct formula <math>V=bh</math> to <math>V=Bh</math> (<math>V=bh</math> is mathematically incorrect)             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>clarify/correct formula <math>V=bh</math>, should be <math>V=Bh</math></li> <li>Pg. 56 4 ... describe a sequence that</li> </ul> </li> <li>Describe a sequence of <u>transformations</u>.</li> <li>B is a side length; B is area of base             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“taken” → unclear</li> <li>Should use transformed</li> </ul> </li> <li>8.G.1 a,b,c. “<del>taken</del>” → “replace” <u>transform</u></li> <li></li> <li>8.G.2 and 4, add of transformations.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Describe a sequence of <u>transformations</u>.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
8	Fractions	1	1	8.F.4. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construct a “function” should be an “equation”             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Function notation is not required in Grade 8.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
6-8	Statistics & Probability	1	1	(Clarity) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pg. 45 6.SP.3, 5c.+d.</li> <li>6.SP.</li> <li>Please add specific examples for 6.SP.3+5 c+d.</li> <li>Examples like provided on pg. 50 Grade 7 2,3 and 4</li> <li>Pg. 50</li> <li>7.SP.3.</li> <li>Informally assess the degree of visual overlap of two ...</li> <li>(example provided does not clarify visual overlap)</li> <li>Pg. 51</li> <li>7.SP.6.</li> <li>Replace “on the chance process that produces it “through a simulation”</li> <li>Pg. 51</li> <li>7.SP.7.</li> <li>Replace to clarify</li> <li><u>From</u> if the “agreement is not good”</li> <li><u>To</u> - if the comparison does not agree</li> <li>Pg. 51</li> <li>7.SP. a + b.</li> <li>Clarify “<u>uniform</u>” term and “<u>not uniform</u>”</li> <li>Pg. 51</li> <li>7.SP.8.a.</li> <li>Clarify “ ... is the <u>fraction of outcomes</u>”</li> </ul>

High School	Algebra	1	1	<p>(Clarity)</p> <p>Pg. 66</p> <p>A.REI.8.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider removing "... in a vector variable."</li> </ul> <p>Pg. 66</p> <p>A.REI.10</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarify terms "curve" + "line"</li> <li>Consider removing ... "often forming a curve (which could be a line)."</li> </ul> <p>(Rigor/College &amp; Career Ready)</p> <p>Pg. 66, A.REI. 8+9.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Change status</li> <li>Consider requiring both 8 and 9 (removing the optional (+))</li> </ul>
High School	Functions	1	1	<p>(Clarity)</p> <p>Pg. 69, F-IF.7.e.   midline</p> <p>Pg. 70, F-TF.5.</p> <p>Pg. 70, F-BF.1.a.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarify ... "or steps for calculation from a context."</li> </ul> <p>Pg. 71, F-TF. 5.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarify term "midline" <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What it means</li> <li>How to use it</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

High School	Geometry	1	0 +	<p>(Clarity)</p> <p>Pg. 75, G-C0.7.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarify <u>corresponding pairs</u> of sides <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>e.g. add the term all to specify</li> <li>“only if <u>all</u> corresponding pairs of sides ...</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Pg. 77, G-SRT.4.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prove theorems about triangles. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>... How the Pythagorean Theorem can be used for similar triangles.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>(Rigor/College &amp; Career Ready)</p> <p>Pg. 76, G-C0.8.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Missing AAS</b> (ASA, SAS, and SSS)</li> <li>There’s really 4 criteria and only three were listed</li> </ul> <p>Pg. 77, (Rigor/College &amp; Career Ready)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>G-SRT</li> <li>10 and 11 all currently (+)</li> <li>10 and 11 should be included without the “+”</li> </ul> <p><b>G-SRT.3.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>This only requires two ways.</b></li> <li><b>Include the other ways to prove triangles are similar.</b></li> </ul> <p>Pg. 78,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>G-C.5. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Clarify which angle</b></li> <li>Add the clarifier “<b>central</b>” by an angle</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Pg. 78, G-GPE.4.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>topic is too broad</li> </ul>
High School	Modeling	1	1	<p>Reinforce that modeling is throughout (pg. 72)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Move modeling pg. 72 to pg. 57 in appropriate space.</li> <li>Update pg. 57 (remove current listing as a standard)</li> </ul>
High School	Number & Quantity	1	1	

High School	Statistics & Probability	0 +	1	<p>(Clarity)</p> <p>Pg. 81, S-ID.6 a,b,c.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Is <u>function</u> the right word?</li> <li>○ e.g. “fit a model to the data informally assess the model”</li> </ul> <p>Pg. 82, S-CP.3.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Add an example to clarify</li> </ul> <p>Pg. 82, S-IC.5.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Clarify “two treatments”</li> <li>○ What is meant by treatments ...Medical?</li> </ul> <p>(Rigor/College &amp; Career Ready)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sp. Cp. 8 &amp; 9 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Required for all students</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Pg. 83, 5.b.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Expected values are important</li> <li>○ <u>Should include for all</u></li> <li>○ 6 &amp; 7 puts probability in context</li> </ul> <p>SP. 5b, 6, &amp; 7.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ should be taught as it puts probability into context</li> </ul>
-------------	--------------------------	-----	---	---

### Rating Guide:

#### Clarity

**0** = Does not guide learning for students and/or support educator communication of the standard to parents

**1** = Guides learning for students and/or supports educator communication of the standard to parents

#### Rigor/College & Career Ready

**0** = Does not support complex reasoning, depth/breadth of complex content, and/or college and career readiness

**1** = Supports complex reasoning, depth/breadth of complex content, and/or college and career readiness

## **Appendix M: Participant Input for Final Meeting**

### **Participant Design Input for the Final Review Panel Meeting Oct. 24, 2014**

#### **Report/Standards Revisions/Summary**

- Would like to see a draft of the actual changes in the standards – a red-line draft would be good.
  - See draft of final report
  - Helpful to have an executive summary so that the group can see it.
  - Bring back to the group info on their work and any revisions.
  - Just want to know what will happen with all of this work- and not find it out first from the media – some sort of communication about this.
- 

#### **K-12 Review Their Group's Input/Revisions/Suggestion**

- An opportunity for all ELA subgroups to see and discuss ALL sub-group recommended changes and notes. Same for math.
  - Gallery walk to look at the progression K-12 (7-8 seems less rigorous).
  - Get to read all the comments and notes from the groups before the meeting.
- 

#### **OTHER**

- Use this group to ask some other questions about the Common Core and other initiatives and find out what they are thinking about implementation.
- Consider:



Bringing in experts like Jim Milgram to bring research –based proven standards (MA, CA)

K-3 – child psychologists have said CCSS developmentally inappropriate.

Gaps – what's out there?

- Concern of the Primary Group – the whole child is not in the standards – bring in guiding principles.

## Appendix N: Agenda for Final Meeting

### **Maine Learning Standards Review**

*Cross State Office Building – Room 103 A & B*

*Oct. 24, 2014*

8:30 Coffee

9:00 Session Starts

12:15 Session Ends

### **Agenda**

*Judy Enright and Cathy McCue, Facilitators*

- 9:00 Welcome and Opening Comments:  
*Commissioner Jim Rier*
- 9:10 Outcomes, Agenda Overview, and Connector
- 9:15 Team Discussions of K-12 ELA and Math Work
  - K-12 Math Team Meets and Reviews Their K-12 Work
  - K-12 ELA Team Meets and Reviews Their K-12 Work and DOE's ELA Notes
  - Both Team Review the Draft Maine's Learning Standards Review Process Report
  - Self-manage Your Break
- 10:15 DOE Team Discussion of The Panel's Proposed Standards Revisions, Observations, Notations, and Suggestions: *Anita Bernhardt and Rachelle Tome*
- 11:00 What Happens Next in This Process?  
*Deb Friedman*
- 11:30 Maine's Learning Standards Review Process:  
The Report
  - Feedback and Suggestions for Revision
- 12:00 Participant Feedback

- 12:15 Meeting Closure

*Lunch in the Cafeteria for Those Who Wish...*

## Appendix O: Participant Feedback on the Review Process

### Participant Feedback on the Review Panel Process

Oct. 24, 2014

#### RESULTS

The Task of the Review Panel was to “Assess the level of rigor and clarity of English Language Arts and Mathematics Standards.” Numbers in ( )s indicate number of panelists for that rating.

#### 1. Was the review process that the facilitator’s designed effective?

		(1)	(5)	(8)
1	2	3	4	5
Not Effective	Fair	Average	Very Good	Highly Effective

#### 2. Were the meetings well facilitated?

			(4)	(10)
1	2	3	4	5
Poorly Facilitated	Fair	Average	Very Good	Excellent Facilitated

#### 3. Do you feel that your voice was heard during the review process?

			(4)	(10)
1	2	3	4	5
Not heard	Fair	Average	Very Good	Completely Heard

#### 4. Do you feel that the Review Panel accomplished its task?

“Assess the level of rigor and clarity of English Language Arts and Mathematics Standards.”

			(3)	(11)
1	2	3	4	5
Not Accomplished	Very Little	Partially	Mostly	Accomplished

#### 5. Do you feel that the Draft Panel Report presented today accurately reflects your work?

		(2*)	(5)	(7)
1	2	3	4	5

Does Not Reflect      Very Little      Somewhat      Mostly      Completely Represents

\*"But we have made revisions and I feel confident  
It will be accurate with our new understanding and work."

## Maine DOE clarification related to recommended edits by the review panel

Grade Level	Standard	Clarity	Rigor	Notes from review panel	Maine DOE Response
K-5	ELA: Foundational Skills: Print Concepts	1	0	(Rigor/College & Career Ready) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grade 1 indicator for print concepts would be better placed in kindergarten.</li> </ul>	<p>It sounds like the Review Panel is recommending that the Grade 1 indicator for print concepts be moved to Kindergarten so that the Kindergarten standard would read:</p> <p>1. Demonstrate understanding of the organization and basic features of print.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Follow words from left to right, top to bottom, and page by page.</li> <li>b. Recognize that spoken words are represented in written language by specific sequences of letters.</li> <li>c. Understand that words are separated by spaces in print.</li> <li>d. Recognize and name all upper- and lowercase</li> </ul>

					<p>letters of the alphabet.</p> <p>e. Recognize the distinguishing features of a sentence (e.g., first word, capitalization, ending punctuation).</p>
K-5	ELA: Writing: Range of Writing	1	0	<p>(Rigor/College &amp; Career Ready)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should start in kindergarten! (contradicts the standards for T, T &amp; P)</li> <li>• Transition for 5<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> grade is good.</li> </ul>	<p>It sounds like the review panel is suggesting that the Range of Writing standard (#10) should also be included at K, 1 and 2 so that the following language is reflected for Standard #10 in these grades:</p> <p>Write routinely over extended time frames (time for research, reflection, and revision) and shorter time frames (a single sitting or a day or two) for a range of discipline-specific tasks, purposes, and audiences.</p>

6-12	Informational Text: Key Ideas and Details	0	0	<p>(clarity)</p> <p>We question the clarity, as it impacts rigor, of standard #2 as it develops from grade 7 through 12. Specifically , the focus seems to shift from two or more central ideas in grade 67 (sic), to one (a) central ideas in grade 8, to two or more central ideas in grade 9 and beyond. Did the authors intend that the grade 8 standard start with “Determine <u>the</u> – rather than <u>a</u> – central ideas?”</p> <p>(Rigor/College and Career Ready)</p> <p>We think #1 is clear and rigorous, ditto for #3.</p>	It sounds like the review panel is suggesting changing “a” central idea to “the” central idea to provide clarity of the standard progression from grade 7 through grade 12.
6-8	Writing: Production and Distribution	0		For Standard #6. Language seems to be dated, fuzzy and unclear. Exactly what should a student be able to do?	It sounds like the Review Panel would like the Maine DOE to provide guidance about how technology impacts writing. No change in language to the language of the standards. Replace “Use the internet...” with “Use digital tools...”
			0	Because #6 is unclear and outdated, we cannot figure out if the flow from 6-8 is rigorous.	It sounds like the review panel would like the Maine DOE to provide guidance about how to



					assure the progression of rigor in grades 6-8. <b>No</b> change in language to the language of the standards.
6-8	Reading: Social Studies/History: Craft and Structure	1	0	(Rigor/College and Career Ready) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The panel suggests that these standards are cross-referenced to those craft standards embedded within language standards.</li> <li>2. Whole span is lacking rigor.</li> </ol>	<p>It sounds like the review panel would like the Maine DOE to provide guidance that demonstrates the relationship between the language standards and texts usually encountered in history or social studies classes. No change in language to the language of the standards.</p> <p>On reconsideration, the panel asserted that rigor is inherent in the text complexity.</p>
6-8	Reading: Science and Technical Subjects: Key Ideas and Details	1	0	(Rigor/College and Career Ready) 1 + 3 rigor through 6-8 grade span	<p>It sounds like the review panel would like the Maine DOE to provide guidance and support to understand rigor in grades 6-8.</p> <p>No change in language is needed to the language of the standards.</p>

9-12	ELA: Literature: Integrations of Knowledge and Ideas	1	0	<p>(Rigor/College and Career Ready)</p> <p>Analyze/Demonstrate</p> <p>Should #9 be switched from grade spans? Which is higher level?</p> <p>Should #9 in the 11-12 span be more inclusive and more beyond “demonstrate”?</p> <p>Seems to be a simple compare/contrast for #9 in the 11-12 span.</p>	<p>It sounds like the Review Panel would like the Maine DOE to provide guidance and support to understand reading standard #9.</p> <p>No change in language is needed to the language of the standards.</p> <p>Additional feedback from the panel indicated to change the language of standards at grade 11-12 span to read. “by analyzing how two or more texts from.”</p>
9-12	ELA: Writing: Text Types and Purposes	1	0	<p>(Rigor/College and Career Ready)</p> <p>1 for 11-12 students: 1d.2e=delete formal; replace with appropriate and effective . . .</p> <p>2 – delete objective</p> <p>3.c – build upon this language for 1d and 2e</p> <p>Formal style and objective tone is limiting and “schoolish”</p>	<p>It sounds like the review panel recommends that the standard be changed to read:</p> <p>e. Establish and maintain an appropriate and effective style and <del>objective</del> tone while attending to the norms and conventions of the discipline in which they are writing.</p>
K-2	Geometry	<del>0</del> 1	1	(Clarity)	The panel recommends

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• K.G.3. Take out “(“solid”)”.</li> </ul> (Rigor/College & Career Ready) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A panelist wants more emphasis on professional development related to understanding fractions (see 1.G.3 &amp; 2.G.3).</li> </ul>	taking out the word “solid.”
K-2	Measurement & Data	0 1	0 1	<p>??? → We noticed the calendar (e.g. days of week, months) is not included; would it be appropriate to include this here.</p> (Clarity) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2.MD.5 Take out “such as drawings of rulers...”</li> <li>• 2. MD.2 Change it to “Measure the length of an object twice, using 2 units; describe how the measurements relate to the size of the unit chosen.”</li> <li>• 2. MD.7 Add “including noon and midnight.”</li> </ul>	The panel recommends: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Take out “such as drawings of rulers...”</li> <li>2. Change to “Measure the length of an object twice, using 2 units; describe how the measurements relate to the size of the unit chosen.”</li> <li>3. Add “including noon and midnight.”</li> </ol>
3-5	Measurement & Data	0 1	1	(Clarity) <p>4.MD.3. Include the formulas for area and perimeter of rectangles.</p> <p>5.MD.5b. Change it to big B. <math>V=b \times h</math> <math>V=B \times h</math></p>	The panel recommends: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Include the formulas for area and perimeter of rectangles.</li> <li>2. 5.MD.5b. Change it to big B.</li> </ol>
3-5	Number Operations Fractions	0 1	1	HS – Wonders how you assess “understanding.” Should “understanding” be replaced by “know” or “demonstrate.” (Clarity) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5.NO-5.5. Define the term “scaling” in the glossary.</li> </ul>	The panel recommends:  To define the term “scaling” in the glossary.
3-5	Operations &	1	1	(Clarity)	The panel recommends:

→

	Algebraic Thinking			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3.OA.3. Include “symbol or letter”</li> </ul>	That that “... or letter...” be included.
6-8	The Number System	1	0 4	<p>(Clarity) We did not find the following to be compellingly clear:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pg. 42 6.NS # 3</li> <li>Pg. 43 # 5</li> <li>Pg. 43 # 6 Part C – Part 2</li> </ul> <p>-----</p> <p>6NS3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What does it mean “the” standard algorithm? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fluently add, subtract, multiply, and divide multi-digit decimals using a standard or an accurate algorithm for each operation.</li> </ul> </li> <li>6NS5. Remove “together” – understand that positive and negative numbers are used to describe.</li> <li>6NS6C Re-word. Find and position points (using integers and other rational #'s) on a coordinate plane.</li> </ul>	<p>The panel recommends:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changing language related to fluency and algorithm.</li> <li>Remove the word “together” in 6NS5.</li> <li>Reword “find position points.”</li> </ol>
6-8	Geometry	1	0 4	<p>(Clarity) - see attached sheet</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6.G 1 “special” quadrilateral <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>List which ones</li> <li>What is special – list special ones for this grade level</li> </ul> </li> <li>6.G 2 correct formula <math>V=bh</math> to <math>V=Bh</math> (<math>V=bh</math> is mathematically incorrect) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>clarify/correct formula</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The panel recommends:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Listing of special quadrilaterals.</li> <li>Change <math>V=bh</math> to <math>V=Bh</math>.</li> <li>Replace “taken” with some other term.</li> <li>Add “of transformations.”</li> </ol>

				<p><math>V=bh</math>, should be <math>V=Bh</math></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Pg. 56 4 ... describe a sequence that</li> <li>• Describe a sequence of transformations.</li> <li>• B is a side length B is area of base <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ “taken” → unclear</li> <li>○ Should use transformed</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 8.G 1 a,b,c “taken” → “replace” transform</li> <li>•</li> <li>• 8.G 2 and 4 add of transformations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Describe a sequence of transformations.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
High School	Geometry	1	0 ±	<p>(Clarity) Pg. 75 G- C0 7</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarify corresponding <u>pairs</u> of sides <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ e.g. add the term all to specify</li> <li>○ “only if <u>all</u> corresponding pairs of sides ...”</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Pg 77 G-SRT 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prove theorems about triangles. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ ... How the Pythagorean Theorem can be used for similar triangles.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>(Rigor/College &amp; Career Ready)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pg 76 G – C0 8 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Missing AAS (ASA, SAS, and SSS)</li> <li>○ There’s really 4 criteria and only three were listed.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The panel recommends:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Changes need to be made to include AAS as part of the solution set.</li> <li>2. Change to include more ways to solve.</li> <li>3. Add “central” to angle in G-C 5.</li> </ol>

				<p>Pg. 77 (Rigor/College &amp; Career Ready)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• G-SRT</li> <li>• 10 and 11 all currently (+)</li> <li>• 10 and 11 should be included without the “+”</li> </ul> <p>G-SRT 3.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This only requires two ways.</li> <li>• Include the other ways to prove triangles are similar.</li> </ul> <p>Pg 78</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• G-C 5 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Clarify which angle</li> <li>○ Add the clarifier “central” by an angle</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Pg 78</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• G-GPE 4 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ topic is too broad</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
High School	Statistics & Probability	<b>0 ±</b>	1	<p>(Clarity)</p> <p>Pg. 81</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• S-ID 6 a,b,c <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Is function the right word?</li> <li>○ e.g. “fit a model to the data informally assess the model”</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Pg. 82 S-CP 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Add an example to clarify</li> </ul> <p>Pg. 82 S-IC 5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Clarify “two treatments”</li> <li>○ What is meant by treatments ...Medical?</li> </ul>	All the “plus” standards need to be included as a requirement for high school graduation for ALL students.

				<p>(Rigor/College &amp; Career Ready)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sp. Cp. 8 &amp; 9 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Required for all students</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Pg. 83</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5.b <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Expected values are important</li> <li>○ Should include for all</li> <li>○ 6 &amp; 7 puts probability in context</li> </ul> </li> <li>• s.p. 5b, 6, &amp; 7 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ should be taught as it puts probability into context</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--	---	--